

REMARKS

Independent Claims 1 and 10 are amended to better distinguish the inventions claimed therein over the prior art cited by the Examiner.

Claim 5 is rewritten in independent form and contains all of the limitations of original Claims 1 and 4, from which Claim 5 originally depended.

Independent Claims 11, 18, 21 and 24 are not amended to better distinguish the inventions claimed therein over the prior art cited by the Examiner, but rather are amended to better point out the subject matter of the inventions claimed therein. It should be noted that these independent claims are so amended that some of the elements previously recited as being included with the previously claimed system are not now positively recited as being included with the currently claimed apparatus.

The current amendments to dependent Claims 12-17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25 and 26 are merely changes in terminology that are made to conform the terminology of such amended dependent claims to the terminology of the currently amended independent claims from which such currently amended dependent claims depend.

The Summary of the Invention portion of the Specification is amended to be consistent with the amended claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 102

Claims 1-4

The inventions recited in currently amended Claims 1-4 are patentable over *Anderson et al.* under 35 USC 102 and 103 for the following reasons:

The Key-View PC disclosed by *Anderson et al.* is not a discrete access-prevention device consisting of a first connector for connection to the given port, a second connector for connection to the network, electrically powered switching means connected in series between the first and second connectors and operable in response to a given control signal for preventing receipt by the first connector of any network communications from

the second connector and/or for preventing receipt by the second connector of any network communications from the first connector, and a control terminal connected to the switching means for providing said given control signal to the switching means from an external source, as recited in currently amended Claim 1. Instead, the Key-View PC is a complex device that includes many components that are adapted for providing a myriad of functions in addition to the functions recited in Claim 1 that the Examiner has asserted are provided by some of the components of the Key-View PC.

As pointed out in the Summary of the Invention portion of the present application at page 3, lines 12-14, the present invention provides inexpensive, easily used apparatus for preventing undesired communications by a given network-connected computer with another computer within the network. Such an inexpensive, easily used apparatus is provided by including the discrete access-prevention device recited in Claim 1. Such an inexpensive, easily used apparatus is not suggested by *Anderson et al.*'s description of the complex multi-functional Key-View PC.

Applicants respectively disagree the Examiner's application of the disclosure of *Anderson et al.* to the claims. For example, the Key-View PC is not a control terminal in the same (or an equivalent) sense as the control terminal recited in Claim 1, for which the only support in the present application is control terminal 29. Nonetheless, it appears that the Key-View PC may include components for providing the functions of the access-prevention device recited in Claim 1. However, as pointed out above, the Key-View PC also includes additional components for providing a myriad of additional functions not recited in Claim 1 and thereby is not "a discrete access-prevention device consisting of ...", as recited in currently amended Claim 1.

The discrete access-prevention device recited in Claim 1 would not have been suggested by *Anderson et al.* to a person of ordinary skill in the art because (1) the primary thrust of *Anderson et al.*'s teaching is the enabling of remote access between a given network-connected computer and another computer within the network rather than the selective prevention of such access, as provided by the present invention, and (2) *Anderson et al.* do not suggest any motivation for providing the simple discrete access-prevention device recited in Claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

Claim 5

The rejection of Claim 5 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over *Anderson et al.* and *Thacker* is respectfully traversed for the following reasons:

Neither *Anderson et al.* nor *Thacker* suggest any motivation for using presence sensing means for initiating a measurement of an interval when an operator is not present within a predetermined space adjacent a computer for the purpose of preventing access to the computer when the interval exceeds a predetermined duration, as recited in Claim 5. The proximity detector of *Thacker* is used merely for detecting the presence of a person in a monitored space. *Anderson et al.* do not state that the automatic logout at the end of a measured interval, as described at column 61, line 67 to column 62, line 26, is based upon whether a person is present at a workstation. Instead, the automatic logout is based upon inactivity. Although absence of an operator from the workstation can be inferred by inactivity, such an inference is tenuous and often erroneous.

The Examiner's assertion that one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use *Thacker's* proximity detector in the Key-View PC because it would provide redundant means for determining if a person is present at a work station is not well founded because *Anderson et al.* do not suggest any motivation for providing redundancy for any of the functions of the Key-View PC. The only mention of redundancy by *Anderson et al.* is at column 4, lines 53-55, where some redundant hardware is described, and at column 25, lines 19-30, where it is stated that the function described therein does not result in redundant polling. Thus, *Anderson et al.* teach away from providing redundant functions in that none of the many functions described therein are described as being redundant, and it is pointed out that one of the described functions does not result in a redundant function.

Claims 6-10

The inventions recited in original dependent Claims 6-9 and currently amended independent Claim 10 are patentable over *Anderson et al.* and *Thacker* under 35 USC 102 and 103 for the same reasons as submitted above for the patentability of Claims 1-4.

Claims 11-17

The rejection of Claims 11-17 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over *Anderson et al.* and *Thacker* is respectfully traversed for the following reason:

Assuming that the Key-View PC can function as the access-prevention device broadly recited in independent Claim 11, *Anderson et al.* do not suggest that the Key-View PC might be disposed within the chassis that contains any of the host computers 201, 202, 203, 204, as required by Claim 11, wherein it is recited that the access-prevention device is disposed within a chassis that contains the given computer.

Claim 12

The rejection of Claim 12 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over *Anderson et al.* and *Thacker* is also respectfully traversed for the following reason:

Anderson et al. do not suggest that a control device for controlling the access-prevention functions of the Key-View PC is disposed on the chassis that contains the given computer, as required by Claim 12.

Claim 13

The rejection of Claim 13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over *Anderson et al.* and *Thacker* is also respectfully traversed for the following reason:

Anderson et al. do not suggest that a control device containing a keyboard for controlling the access-prevention functions of the Key-View PC is connected to any of the host computers 201, 202, 203, 204, as required by Claim 13, wherein it is recited that the control device includes the keyboard that is connected to the given computer for controlling operation of the given computer.

Claim 14

The rejection of Claim 14 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over *Anderson et al.* and *Thacker* is also respectfully traversed for the following reason:

Anderson et al. do not suggest that a control device containing a mouse for controlling the access-prevention functions of the Key-View PC is connected to any of the host computers 201, 202, 203, 204, as required by Claim 14, wherein it is recited that the control device includes the mouse that is connected to the given computer for controlling operation of the given computer.

Claim 16

The rejection of Claim 16 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over *Anderson et al.* and *Thacker* is also respectfully traversed for the same reasons as submitted above for traversing the rejection of Claim 5.

Claims 18-20

The rejection of Claims 18-20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over *Anderson et al.* and *Thacker* is respectfully traversed for the following reason:

Assuming that the Key-View PC can function as the access-prevention device broadly recited in independent Claim 18, *Anderson et al.* do not suggest that the Key-View PC might be disposed within the chassis that contains a modem that is connected to a host computer 201, 202, 203, 204 for processing communications by the host computer with another computer within the network, as required by Claim 18, wherein it is recited that the access-prevention device is disposed within a chassis that contains the modem. The only support in the present application for the recited modem is the modem 19.

Claim 19

The rejection of Claim 19 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over *Anderson et al.* and *Thacker* is also respectfully traversed for the following reason:

Anderson et al. do not suggest that a control device for controlling the access-prevention functions of the Key-View PC is disposed on the chassis that contains the modem, as required by Claim 19.

Claims 21-23

The rejection of Claims 21-23 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over *Anderson et al.* and *Thacker* is respectfully traversed for the following reason:

Assuming that the Key-View PC can function as the access-prevention device broadly recited in independent Claim 21, *Anderson et al.* do not suggest that the Key-View PC might be disposed within the chassis that contains an external network-access terminal that is connected in series with a host computer 201, 202, 203, 204 for enabling said bi-directional communication by the host computer with another computer within the network, as required by Claim 21, wherein it is recited that the access-prevention device is disposed within a chassis that contains the external network-access terminal. The only support in the present application for the recited external network-access terminal is the external network-access terminal 20.

Claim 22

The rejection of Claim 22 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over *Anderson et al.* and *Thacker* is also respectfully traversed for the following reason:

Anderson et al. do not suggest that a control device for controlling the access-prevention functions of the Key-View PC is disposed on the chassis that contains the external network-access terminal, as required by Claim 22.

Claims 24-26

The rejection of Claims 24-26 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over *Anderson et al.* and *Thacker* is respectfully traversed for the following reason:

Assuming that the Key-View PC can function as the access-prevention device broadly recited in independent Claim 24, *Anderson et al.* do not suggest that the Key-View PC might be disposed within the chassis that contains an external firewall device that is connected to a host computer 201, 202, 203, 204 for providing firewall protection for the host computer, as required by Claim 24, wherein it is recited that the access-prevention device is disposed within a chassis that contains the external firewall device.

Claim 25


The rejection of Claim 25 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over *Anderson et al.* and *Thacker* is also respectfully traversed for the following reason:

Anderson et al. do not suggest that a control device for controlling the access-prevention functions of the Key-View PC is disposed on the chassis that contains the external firewall device, as required by Claim 25.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated 7-27-04



Edward W. Callan
Attorney for Applicants
Attorney Registration No. 24,720

Customer No. 22653

Telephone: (858) 259-5533
Facsimile: (858) 259-5537
Email: ecallan1@san.rr.com